

The Dignity at Work Task Force
Of the Brandeis University Faculty Senate

**Recommended Policies and Procedures
to Address Workplace Bullying
By or Towards Brandeis Faculty Members**

First version: February 2018
This version: April 22, 2019

Task Force:

Susan Holcombe (Heller, Emerita)	Liuba Shrira (Computer Science)
Sarah Mead (Music)	Larry Simon (Co-chair, Heller)
Carol Osler (Co-chair, IBS/Economics)	Chad Williams (AAAS and History)
Marion Smiley (Philosophy)	

I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Brandeis prides itself on valuing the dignity and worth of each individual. President Liebowitz echoed that pride recently when he reminded us that “Nothing short of respect for and openness to all in our community should be acceptable.”¹

The Dignity at Work Task Force of the Faculty Senate was tasked with proposing policies and procedures for addressing Workplace Bullying when it involves Faculty. A major portion of that effort was to clarify and professionalize the Faculty Senate’s role in addressing complaints of Workplace Bullying.

With respect to grievance procedures, the Task Force recommends that complaints be resolved informally, if possible. The Office of the Ombuds is a good first stop: they can provide information, support, and referrals. Their services are not well suited, however, for resolving Workplace Bullying concerns.² For informal resolution, complainants can bring their concerns to a Department Chair, a Dean, or an Employee Relations specialist in Human Resources.

The Task Force recommends that the Faculty Senate delegate the adjudication of formal grievances to a new committee of the Senate to be known as the Dignity at Work Committee. Members of this committee will receive specialized training from external experts in understanding, identifying, and resolving Workplace Bullying cases. Because the Handbook already entrusts responsibility for handling formal grievances to the Faculty Senate, this proposal provides for more enlightened handling of such cases but maintains the centuries-old tradition of faculty self-governance. The proposed Committee will also be consistent with newly-approved faculty governance structures.

The Dignity at Work Committee will comprise six faculty members nominated by the faculty and appointed by the Faculty Senate Council, one each from the four divisions of A&S, Heller, and IBS. The Committee will also include a representative of the VP for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; a representative for staff; and a representative for graduate students.³ The University Counsel will be actively consulted on each case. Faculty members of this committee should be nominated by the faculty at large and appointed by the Faculty Senate, which should strive for maximum diversity in terms of contract/T-TT, race, gender, age, etc. The staff representative should be appointed by BUSAC; the graduate student representative should be appointed by GSAS.

Each formal complaint will be adjudicated by a three-member Sub-committee tailored to that complaint. One member would be in charge of working with the complainant and respondent.

¹ Letter to campus on April 12, 2018.

² Esque Walker, Ph.D. (2013). No Mediation for Workplace Bullying.
<https://www.workplacebullying.org/walker/#more-11358>

³ Note: Issues of conduct involving undergraduates already benefit from clear and carefully-crafted grievance procedures. See <https://www.brandeis.edu/studentlife/srcs/rightsresponsibilities/2017-18%20RR.pdf>.

A second member will handle the investigation jointly with the University's professional investigator. For a complaints to be considered, the most recent alleged misconduct must have occurred within three years of the complaint itself.

On the basis of the investigation, the Sub-committee will determine whether a complaint is supported by the evidence or "substantiated." If so, the Sub-committee will recommend appropriate consequences for respondents and/or restorative measures for the target. Because such measures are implemented by the Provost, their final form should be negotiated, if needed, between the Sub-committee, the Provost, and the Faculty Senate Chair. For unsubstantiated complaints the Sub-committee may propose restorative measures for the respondent.

Consistent with the Faculty Handbook, appeals must be based on procedural concerns and will initially be considered by the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Further appeals must go to the President, whose decision is final.

The Dignity at Work Committee will require explicit standards of behavior to adjudicate a complaint. This proposal recommends a specific definition of Workplace Bullying the elements of which are all commonplace among legal definitions abroad. It also clarifies how Workplace Bullying differs from discrimination and harassment, free speech, normal and appropriate management, and occasional ill temper.

Prevention of Workplace Bullying is as important as establishing grievance procedures. The Task Force summarizes generally-recommended measures for accountability, education, and mentoring. It also stresses the importance of holding academic leadership accountable for promoting a culture of mutual respect and for protecting community members' safety and dignity. Leaders should promptly address complaints or evidence of Workplace Bullying; anyone involved should be treated fairly, respectfully, and with compassion.

It is also critical for the community to be familiar with the nature and consequences of Workplace Bullying. The Task Force recommends mandatory training for all new faculty and for all search committees as well as regular reminders as part of HR's annual reviews. The Task Force also recommends mandatory training for Deans and Chairs that includes wise approaches for responding to reports of Workplace Bullying and for preventing such conduct.

Finally, it is important for the University to be informed about the extent and nature of Workplace Bullying on campus. The Task Force recommends that a careful and professional analysis of the current workplace culture be followed by periodic monitoring, which could be achieved in a variety of ways: Periodic climate surveys, regular employee focus groups, a confidential reporting line, mandatory reporting, regular qualitative summaries of the challenges the Ombuds observe on campus, 360-degree evaluations of deans and department chairs, stay interviews, and exit interviews.

II. WHAT IS WORKPLACE BULLYING?

Workplace Bullying has two key features: disrespect towards the target and persistence. A direct analogy to domestic violence is often noted by experts. The central importance of persistence is consistently stressed by experts, as illustrated below:

Many of [the behaviors associated with workplace bullying] may be relatively common in the workplace and, when occurring in isolation, may be seen as signs of ... “incivility” at work. When persistently directed towards the same individual(s) over a longer period of time, they may turn into an extreme source of social stress, capable of causing severe harm. ... Thus, the emphasis is as much on the frequency and duration of what is done as it is on what and how it is done.⁴

As discussed in our literature survey,⁵ targets of workplace bullying are disproportionately women, minorities, and other traditionally disadvantaged groups. Bullies are only modestly more likely to be male than female. Power abuse is an almost-universal feature: roughly three-quarters of targets are subordinate to their bullies; other sources of power imbalance include membership in the dominant workplace culture and influence with higher authorities within the organization.

For the practical purposes the Dignity at Work Task Force recommends the following definition of Workplace Bullying:⁶

- Workplace Bullying is a persistent pattern of unwelcome conduct that a reasonable person in the same circumstances would consider unreasonable.⁷
- Workplace Bullying includes behavior that is belittling, disempowering, insulting, intimidating, humiliating, offending, or threatening.
- Workplace Bullying behavior must have the cumulative purpose or effect of harming an employee’s health, reputation, career success, or ability to perform.

Many complaints of Workplace Bullying will be substantiated by a persistent pattern of outright negative conduct such as:

-
- Insulting or humiliating the target, especially in front of others
 - Blocking or providing insufficient opportunities for advancement
 - Withholding necessary information, excluding from important discussions

Workplace Bullying is often carried out in a passive-aggressive manner, in which case it could be substantiated by a persistent pattern of behaviors such as:

- Frequently treating someone as invisible (ghosting)
- Failing to respond, or responding with a substantial delay, to inquiries or requests

⁴ Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). The concept of bullying at work. In C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 3-30). (London: Taylor & Francis).

⁵ https://www.brandeis.edu/faculty-senate/pdfs/SurveyOfResearchOnWorkplaceBullying_DignityAtWorkTaskForce_Feb2018pdf.pdf

⁶ This is consistent with Principle 6 of the Brandeis Principles of Free Speech.

⁷ The Task Force recommends the reasonable person standard of *Black’s Law Dictionary, Ninth Edition*: "...a person who exercises the degree of attention, knowledge, intelligence, and judgment that society requires of its members for the protection of their own and of others' interests. The reasonable person acts sensibly, does things without serious delay, and takes proper but not excessive precautions..."

- Failing to provide appropriate managerial support

Workplace Bullying is often carried out by a group, in which case it is called “mobbing.” Mobbing could be substantiated by a persistent pattern of behaviors such as:

- Spreading rumors, gossip, or innuendo about the target
- Excluding the target from professional & social events
- Stonewalling a target when she/he inquires about why or seeks redress

Workplace Bullying can be carried out via any mode of communication including telephone, surface mail, e-mail, txts, or any form of social media.

Workplace Bullying does not include speech that is consistent with the *Brandeis Principles of Free Speech and Free Expression* is not. The definition above would not constrain the freedom of faculty to respectfully articulate differing opinions, to criticize the administration or university policies, to take part in political protest, or to promote and participate in labor unions.⁸

Workplace Bullying does not include occasionally-insensitive language or conduct. Everyone is capable of incivilities at work in response to extreme stress due to health issues, family issues, or the like. So long as such behavior is rare and of low intensity it is not considered Workplace Bullying.

Finally, Workplace Bullying does not include appropriate workplace supervision carried out in a respectful manner. In managing faculty, regular supervisory responsibilities include:

- Determining committee assignments
- Providing performance appraisals
- Coaching or providing constructive feedback
- Scheduling ongoing meetings to address performance issues
- Setting aggressive performance goals to help meet departmental goals
- Counseling or disciplining an employee for misconduct, and
- Investigating alleged misconduct.

The behaviors associated with Workplace Bullying are considered harassment and prohibited by law when directed at individuals due to their race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or other legally-protected attributes.⁹ The Task Force recommends that Workplace Bullying be prohibited at Brandeis University regardless of its status under the law.

III. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

The Dignity at Work Task Force recommends that faculty have access to informal as well as formal approaches to deal with Workplace Bullying. Regardless, anyone who begins to suspect

8

⁹ For discrimination and harassment, see <https://www.brandeis.edu/humanresources/policies/non-discrimination-harassment.html>
 For disabilities, see <https://www.brandeis.edu/humanresources/policies/2018%20Policies/Disability%20Accommodation%20and%20Complaint%20Process%202018.pdf>
 For sexual harassment, see <https://www.brandeis.edu/humanresources/policies/Sexual-Harassment-Policy.pdf>

they might be bullied is advised to take careful, frequent notes and to bring a colleague to any meetings with the suspected bully.

III.A. INFORMAL RESOLUTION

Every member of the Brandeis community should be encouraged to resolve issues of Workplace Bullying informally if possible.¹⁰ The following informal approaches should be available to all:

Self-help: Occasionally a target or witness to Workplace Bullying may feel he or she can comfortably discuss it with the individual responsible. They may recognize, for example, that the respondent does not know that their conduct is disturbing.

Unit Heads: In some cases it may be helpful to speak with a Dean, Department Chair, or Director of a Center or Institute (though this would evidently be impossible if the bully is that person.)¹¹ As noted in Section II, these unit heads should be responsible for pro-actively preventing Workplace Bullying, protecting targets, and reporting such concerns to the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Unit heads should respond promptly, respectfully, and compassionately to expressions of concern and should protect the confidentiality of such reports. Managing such complaints is challenging, so the University should ensure that unit heads have a source of expert advice.¹²

Office of the Ombuds: The Brandeis University Ombuds provide confidential support to targets or witnesses of Workplace Bullying: they do not report to any campus official unless there is imminent danger of harm. The Ombuds also provide information about the nature of Workplace Bullying, the extent to which such conduct violates a target's rights, options for addressing such conduct, and referrals to sources for support and advice. Finally, the Brandeis Ombuds at a visitor's request may provide informal dispute resolution services, including 'shuttle diplomacy' where disputants are not in the same room. Informal shuttle diplomacy requires both parties to agree to the process and to be of equal status, which is typically not the case in bullying situations. Dispute resolution procedures in bullying cases often trigger re-traumatization. Coaching and support resources for an individual who has been bullied may be the best service the Ombuds Office can offer during such a difficult time.¹³

Human Resources: Speaking with an employee relations specialist in Human Resources may prove helpful in two ways. First, it may help the University identify a pattern of behavior. Second, it may help to identify and implement a suitable informal solution. As explained in our accompanying literature survey, this option is only recommended under an administration that demonstrates an active commitment to setting and enforcing high standards for conduct.

¹⁰ All the policies and grievance procedures examined in preparation of this document encouraged informal resolution where possible.

¹¹ Field, Tim (2009). *Bully in sight: How to predict, resist, challenge, and combat workplace bullying*. (Success Unlimited: Great Britain).

¹² Note: The advice discussed here concerns management, which is distinct from legal counsel.

¹³ This paragraph was written in consultation with the Ombuds.

III.B. FORMAL COMPLAINTS

The Task Force recommends that the Faculty Senate delegate the adjudication of formal complaints of Workplace Bullying to a new committee, the Dignity at Work Committee.

III.B.1 The Dignity at Work Committee

The Dignity at Work Committee would be responsible for investigating and adjudicating formal complaints about Workplace Bullying towards or by faculty. For a complaint to be considered, the most recent event should have occurred no more than three years previously. For substantiated cases the committee would also be responsible for recommending consequences for the respondent and restorative measures for the complainant. When a case is not substantiated the committee might recommend restorative measures for the respondent.

Membership: The Dignity at Work Committee should have nine members:

- Six faculty members: One from each division with A&S plus one each from Heller and IBS
- VP Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion or his/her representative
- Representative for staff selected by BUSAC
- A representative for graduate students appointed by the Dean of GSAS¹⁴

The Dignity at Work Committee should have the following consultants:

- Brandeis University Counsel
- The University's professional investigator(s).

Appointment process: The Faculty Senate should encourage the nomination and self-nomination of any faculty member who has voting rights at Faculty Meetings. Because the DAW Committee's purpose is to support the Faculty Senate in fulfilling its responsibility to handle complaints involving faculty, the Faculty Senate Council with assistance from the VP of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion or his/her designee.¹⁵ In appointing members, the Faculty Senate should strive for maximum diversity in terms of contract/T-TT/research, race, gender, age, etc. Faculty members of the Dignity at Work Committee should work at least half-time for the University and must have a demonstrated commitment to promoting and protecting workplace dignity. In general, members should be appointed for three-year terms, though this may need to be adjusted to achieve staggered terms or to accommodate faculty contracts.

Training: All members of the Dignity at Work Committee should receive at least one full day of formal education from outside experts on harassment, including Workplace Bullying.¹⁶

Right to information: Members of the Dignity at Work Committee should have the right to all relevant information held at or by the University about the individuals involved in the case, so long as the information is not legally sealed. Relevant information includes, but is not limited

¹⁴ The graduate-student representative is envisioned as an administrator.

¹⁵ Note: Issues of conduct involving undergraduates already benefit from clear and carefully-crafted grievance procedures. See <https://www.brandeis.edu/studentlife/srcs/rightsresponsibilities/2017-18%20RR.pdf>.

¹⁶ E.g., Loreleigh Keashley (<https://comm.wayne.edu/profile/ad8889>), or ELI Incorporated (<https://www.eliinc.com/>)

to: HR records, student evaluations, and unsealed records of any legal past proceedings past or present involving faculty in the case.

Professional protection: Decisions of the Dignity at Work Committee should have no bearing on the committee members' professional responsibilities, perquisites of employment, re-appointments, promotions, etc.

Annual report from VP Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: The Dignity at Work Committee and the Faculty Senate should receive an annual report from the VP Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion on the level and trends in reported Workplace Bullying on campus. The report will be disaggregated by school and by Division within Arts and Sciences.

Administrative support: The Dignity at Work Committee should be provided with administrative support in scheduling and in recording the proceedings of critical meetings.

III.B.2 Responsibilities of Participants in Formal Complaints

Anyone involved in a formal complaint should be held responsible for the following:

Protecting confidentiality: The confidentiality of all parties should be strictly respected within procedural and legal limits. Information should be shared only with those who genuinely need it.

Respondent rights: Respondents have the right to confidentiality; the right to impartiality among Dignity at Work Sub-committee members; the right to share their perspective on the events and to present exculpatory evidence; the right to advice and support from the Ombuds.

Protection from retaliation: Retaliation against complainants, respondents, or witnesses is illegal. Unit heads should pro-actively protect all concerned from retaliation.

Prompt action: Complainants and respondents both have a right to prompt and respectful resolution of Workplace Bullying concerns. In addition, addressing aggression at the earliest possible opportunity protects the University.

III.B.3 Case-specific Sub-committees

Each complaint regarding Workplace Bullying should be handled by a Dignity at Work Sub-committee of three members appointed by the Dignity at Work Committee Chair. A Sub-committee size of three is intended to minimize risks to confidentiality while incorporating views from multiple individuals and ensuring a clear outcome.

The Sub-committee should be appointed promptly, ideally within ten days of receiving a signed complaint. Care should be taken to avoid members with potential conflicts of interest in a given case. Composition of the Sub-committee should depend on the case:

- Three faculty members for faculty-faculty concerns
- One faculty member, the graduate-student representative, and the ODEI representative for student-faculty concerns
- One faculty member, the staff representative, and the ODEI representative for staff-faculty concerns.

If staff or administrators are not involved in the case, the DEI representative becomes a consultant to the Sub-committee. The Office of Legal Counsel should be consulted on all cases.

One member of the Sub-committee will be responsible for communication with the complainant(s) and respondent(s). Specifically, this person is entrusted with ensuring that both parties feel respected and that the process is fair and transparent.

One other member of the Sub-committee will handle the investigation, working as a team with a Brandeis University investigator with deep knowledge of Workplace Bullying.

All members of the Brandeis University community should be required to cooperate with Dignity at Work Sub-committees and forbidden to retaliate.

III.B.4 Adjudication

The Dignity at Work Sub-committee should be responsible for deciding whether the complainant's concerns are justified based on the evidence gathered through the investigation. Upon completion of its work the Sub-committee should label each specific complaint as fitting one of the following three outcomes:

Insufficient evidence: If the investigation proves inconclusive due to a lack of evidence the parties should be informed that a thorough investigation was conducted and was inconclusive.

Unsubstantiated complaints: If the Dignity at Work Subcommittee finds that the complaint is unsubstantiated, then no further inquiry is necessary. The case will be considered closed unless the decision is appealed.

Substantiated complaints: Recommendations should include consequences for respondents and protective and/ or compensatory measures for complainants.

III.B.5 Consequences and Compensatory Measures

For substantiated complaints the Dignity at Work Sub-committee should recommend consequences for respondents and compensatory measures for complainants.

Consequences should be of increasing intensity depending on the severity of the aggression and on the respondent's history. Initial consequences should stress education and behavior modification; subsequent consequences should include adverse consequences to deter future misconduct.

Consequences for respondents may include, but are not limited to:

- Ongoing monitoring
- Mandated counseling or coaching
- Anger management training
- Loss of responsibility in general
- Separation of parties
- Removal of laboratory space
- Cessation of any authority over the complainant (an outcome that should generally *not* be achieved by moving or demoting the complainant)

- Removal of pay increases or salary supplements including summer research support
- Removal of an endowed chair or a specific title
- Denial of access to university research funds
- Recommendation for dismissal in a manner consistent with the Faculty Handbook or University policies.

III.B.6 Additional Procedural Details

The Dignity at Work Committee will necessarily develop additional protocols for its work. The Task Force’s accompanying document, *Suggested Procedural Details for Complaint Adjudication By Dignity at Work Committee of the Faculty Senate*, provides suggestions to speed the Committee on its way.¹⁷

III.C. APPEALS

Complainants and respondents may appeal Dignity at Work Committee decisions solely on procedural grounds. Appeals should initially be brought to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (CFRR), together with documentation describing the investigative procedures followed and the adjudication process. Any further appeal should go to the President, whose decision should be final. If substantial new information emerges, a given complaint can be re-adjudicated but only one time.

IV. PREVENTING WORKPLACE BULLYING

The prevention of Workplace Bullying is no less important than having effective grievance procedures. Researchers stress that prevention requires a pro-active commitment by management to a culture that demands respectful conduct at all times. “[A]n anti-bullying policy is not just about catching bullies, it’s about fostering a climate of dignity and respect”^{18, 19} We complete this proposal by outlining three sets of recommended practices that would

- Hold campus leaders held accountable for modeling and promoting respectful behavior and for enforcing community standards when misconduct occurs
- Educate the community about the nature and consequences of Workplace Bullying.
- Monitor the campus climate and evaluating the success of policies to promote workplace dignity.

We hope and trust that the Administration will move forward expeditiously with preventative measures and look forward to supporting that effort.

V.A LEADERS MUST PROMOTE DIGNITY AT WORK

Experts recommend that an institution’s leaders, from the President on down, be held responsible for promoting a culture of mutual respect and collaboration and for protecting

¹⁷ <https://www.brandeis.edu/faculty-senate/DignityAtWorkTaskForce.html>

¹⁸ Field (1996), *op. cit.*, p. 336.

¹⁹ Rowe, Mary (2003). Dispute Resolution in the Nonunion Environment: An Evolution Toward Integrated Systems for Conflict Management? In S. Gleason (ed.), *Frontiers in Dispute Resolution in Labor Relations and Human Resources* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press), pp. 79–106.

community members' safety and dignity.²⁰ Aggression, like all workplace troubles, should be managed promptly and firmly because "[i]gnoring problems, covering them up, passing them on to subordinates and replacements, or losing them through the committee process ... spawns more problems."²¹

V.A.1 Unit Heads

Academic Deans, Department Chairs, Program Directors, and the Directors of Centers and Institutes should be accountable for setting and enforcing high standards for workplace conduct. Recommended practices for academic unit heads include:

- Explicitly endorsing and disseminating University conduct standards
- Demonstrating those standards consistently in their own conduct
- Intervening promptly when they become aware of Workplace Bullying
- Treating anyone involved with compassion and respect
- Holding such matters in strict confidence
- Carrying out a process that is transparent and fair for all involved. Before any judgment respondents should be provided full information about the allegations and allowed to present their perspective and supporting evidence with respect to the allegations.
- Protecting all concerned from retaliation
- Reporting all allegations of Workplace Bullying involving faculty to the VP Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

These are challenging responsibilities for which faculty members do not at present receive explicit training. Training should be mandatory (see below) and a source of expert advice and coaching should always be available.

These responsibilities should be discussed during a unit head's annual performance appraisal. Performance should be assessed based on formal feedback rather than self-evaluation. No feedback is sought at present but a variety of approaches could be implemented.

If a unit head does not fulfill these responsibilities, potential consequences should include monitoring, coaching, reprimands, lower compensation, or loss of responsibility.

V.A.2 Faculty Members

Faculty members have special status at Universities, and with status comes responsibility. "The power of colleagues to affect the interactions among faculty (for good or ill) is well documented in the research literature on coworker support and bullying."²² Faculty members should take the lead in fostering a work environment free from antagonistic conduct. Indeed, any failure to do so encourages the antagonist and thereby makes the faculty member complicit.²³

²⁰ This section draws on Namie, Gary, and Ruth F. Namie (2011). *Bully in the Workplace: Stock Jerks, Weasels, and Snakes from Killing Your Organization* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; Hoboken, NJ), pp. 149-150.

²¹ Twale, Darla J., and Barbar M. De Luca (2008). *Faculty Incivility: The Rise of the Academic Bully Culture and What to Do About It* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA). pp. 163-164.

²² Keashly, L. & Neuman, J.H. (2013). Workplace bullying and mobbing in U.S. higher education. In M. Duffy and D. Yamada (Eds). *Workplace bullying and mobbing in the U.S.* (Praeger).

²³ This point was stressed by Brandeis University Professor Anita Hill.

Full professors and professors of the practice should be responsible for

- Exemplifying mutual respect and a spirit of collaboration
- Intervening to stop Workplace Bullying
- Supporting targets
- Demonstrating that Workplace Bullying is unacceptable
- Reporting Workplace Bullying to an appropriate information center.

All other faculty should be responsible for reporting Workplace Bullying and, at a minimum, providing private support to targets. If other faculty members feel professionally safe engaging in constructive intervention they are encouraged to do so. Strategies for constructive intervention are suggested in Appendix B.

V.B EDUCATING THE COMMUNITY

It is important to educate the community about the nature and consequences of Workplace Bullying. Targets often do not recognize the nature of the treatment they experience and tolerate adverse treatment far too long; bystanders do not recognize the importance of speaking up to remind those engaging in inappropriate behavior of University values.

The Task Force recommends:²⁴

Easy accessibility of information on Workplace Bullying through the Brandeis website.

Regular reminders for existing faculty: HR's annual reviews of policies on harassment and Title IX should be expanded to cover Workplace Bullying. This training should include some discussion of constructive bystander responses.

Mandatory training on Workplace Bullying for all new faculty:²⁵ HR's new-faculty orientation program should likewise be expanded to cover Workplace Bullying. This training should include some discussion of constructive bystander responses.

Mandatory training for unit heads:²⁶ All unit heads should be trained to understand the nature and costs of Workplace Bullying as well as University policies and procedures for addressing grievances. Finally, unit heads should be trained in recommended practices for responding to reports of Workplace Bullying and recommended practices for preventing such conduct. This education should be received before beginning these responsibilities or soon after doing so.

In addition, all unit heads should learn recommended practices for creating a collaborative and mutually respectful workplace culture. "Higher education ... is a knowledge based culture [in which] the days of because-I-said-so management are gone. [Employees are] motivated and inspired not so much directed and demeaned into submission."²⁷ Training

²⁴ This section draws heavily on many sources, including Twale and De Luca (2008), *op. cit.*, pp. 153-162; and Namie and Namie (2011), *op. cit.*, p. 148.

²⁵ Curry, Lynne (2016), *Beating the Workplace Bully: A Tactical Guide to Taking Charge* (U.S.A.: American Management Association), p. 213.

²⁶ See Namie and Namie (2011), *op. cit.*, pp. 150-151.

²⁷ Hollis, Leah P. (2012). *Bully in the Ivory Tower: How Aggression & Incivility Erode American Higher Education*. (PatriciaBerkly), p. 127.

should be in-person and involve active learning. A simple on-line questionnaire would not be sufficient.

Mandatory training on Workplace Bullying for search committees: Members of search committees for full-time faculty members, department chairs, heads of centers or institutes, or members of the senior administration should be familiar with the nature and costs of Workplace Bullying. They should also be provided with strategies for detecting tendencies towards bullying, because experts recommend that search committees “[t]ry to recognize potential bullies in the interview process.”^{28,29}

V.C MONITORING CONDITIONS ON CAMPUS

The Brandeis University Administration needs information about the nature and extent of Workplace Bullying to address it wisely. The Task Force recommends the following pro-active approaches to gathering information:

A deep investigation of the current campus culture. A focused and extensive investigation of the extent to which the campus culture currently fulfills Brandeis values could be valuable in many ways. Most critically, it would point towards the most fruitful directions for next steps and it would provide a clear baseline for assessing future progress.

Periodic climate survey.³⁰ The Dignity at Work Task Force commends the current Administration for conducting rigorous University-wide climate surveys. We recommend that these surveys include questions on Workplace Bullying, as is currently planned. We also recommend that climate surveys be carried out every two or three years for individual units. This would enable Senior Administrators to monitor the success of unit heads in ensuring that conduct is consistently respectful.

Regular employee focus groups with a trained moderator.³¹ Employees will share their best ideas for progress and their insights about the present when it is professionally safe to do so. Having a trained moderator pose questions on a regular basis creates a sense of normalcy and provides management the opportunity to show that concerns can indeed be aired safely.

A confidential reporting line: The Dignity at Work Task Force commends the current Administration for creating this line and encourages the Administration to bring it to the faculty’s attention periodically.

Mandatory reporting: Unit heads should be required to report all observations of, or complaints about Workplace Bullying by or towards faculty to the VP Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. This VP will file an annual report with the Chair of the Faculty Senate and with the Dignity at Work Committee.

²⁸ Hollis (2012), *op. cit.*, p. 114.

²⁹ Namie and Namie (2011), *op. cit.*, p. 150.

³⁰ Hollis (2012), *op. cit.*, p. 119; Namie and Namie (2011), *op. cit.*, pp. 119-120; Field, Tim (2009). *Bully in sight: How to predict, resist, challenge, and combat workplace bullying.* (Success Unlimited: Great Britain), p. 201.

³¹ <https://www.quantumworkplace.com/future-of-work/employee-focus-groups-your-superpower-improving-employee-engagement/>

Ombuds: The Dignity at Work Task Force commends the current Administration for creating the Office of the Ombuds. We recommend, however, that all Ombuds be explicitly trained to understand and identify Workplace Bullying and to be familiar with options for addressing it. Among the biggest challenges facing targets is their lack of familiarity with the problem and with appropriate responses. Ideally the Ombuds will provide confidential support and coaching and help targets find appropriate resources. Finally, an Ombuds can provide senior management with qualitative information that could be difficult to access.³²

360-degree evaluations of unit heads and senior administrators:³³ These should occur within three years of the individual taking the position and no less frequently than every three years thereafter.

Stay interviews:³⁴ Existing faculty and staff should periodically be asked in-person and in confidence by their direct supervisor about sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction at work.

Exit interviews:³⁵ All employees that depart voluntarily should be interviewed about sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction at work by the VP Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion or his/her representative.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Brandeis Faculty Task Force on Dignity at Work recommends the creation of a new committee under the Faculty Senate to handle formal complaints of Workplace Bullying. This should essentially allow the Faculty Senate to delegate this responsibility to colleagues trained in recognizing bullying and investigating such claims. In short, it would professionalize the handling of such matters while retaining faculty control over faculty governance. Ideally, however, most such concerns will be addressed informally by campus leadership. This report thus recommends that leadership be held accountable for addressing such concerns promptly and respectfully and for promoting a culture of mutual respect. The report also lists recommended practices for educating the community and monitoring conditions on campus.

The Task Force recommends that these policies be reassessed three years after the Dignity at Work Committee comes into existence and every ten years thereafter.

³² This paragraph was written in consultation with the Ombuds.

³³ Hollis (2012), *op. cit.*, p. 118; Curry (2016), p. 214.

³⁴ <https://www.thebalance.com/stay-interview-questions-2062107>

³⁵ Field (1996), *op. cit.*, p. 337; <https://www.thebalance.com/perform-exit-interviews-1919341>